

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/674,369	10/27/2000	William F. Aftoora	WEA-1100	6931
75	590 03/11/2003			
Joseph G Curatolo Renner Kenner Greive Bobak Taylor & Weber 24500 Center Ridge Road Suite 280			EXAMINER	
			PRATT, HELEN F	
Westlake, OH	44145		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1761	111
			DATE MAILED: 03/11/2003	14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
•	•	09/674,369	AFTOORA, WILLIAN F.
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit
	•	Helen F. Pratt	
	Th MAILING DATE of this communication app		1761
Period for	Reply		erroop on a crioc address a
THE M/ - Extensi- after SI/ - If the pe - If NO pe - Failure - Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY AlLING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ons of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 X (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply eriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period with to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, by received by the Office later than three months after the mailing operatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication.
1)⊠ I	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 Ja</u>	anuary 2003 .	
		s action is non-final.	
(Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i> n of Claims	nce except for formal matters, pr Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	osecution as to the merits is 53 O.G. 213.
4)⊠ C	laim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.		
4 a	a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	n from consideration.	
	laim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ C	laim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are rejected.		
7)□ C	laim(s) is/are objected to.		
8)∏ C	laim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.	
Application	n Papers		
	e specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
	e drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ accept		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
	e proposed drawing correction filed oni		ved by the Examiner.
	f approved, corrected drawings are required in reply		
	e oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	miner.	
	der 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
	cknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign p	oriority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).
	All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		
_	Certified copies of the priority documents		
2.[
3.[* See	Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure the attached detailed Office action for a list of	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a))	_
_	nowledgment is made of a claim for domestic		
a) [The translation of the foreign language province translation of the foreign language province to the form the form to make of a claim for domestic	sional application has been rece	ived.
ttachment(s)		••	
) 🔲 Notice of	References Cited (PTO-892) Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) on Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal Pa	PTO-413) Paper No(s) stent Application (PTO-152)
Patent and Traden O-326 (Rev. 04			Part of Paper No. 13



Art Unit: 1761

al.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-42 are indefinite in the use of the term "substantially excludes acidulent components". The metes and bounds of the claims are not known when the claims include the term "substantially".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 6-9, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Luber et al.

The claims are rejected for the reasons of record cited in the last office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luber et Claim 10 is rejected for the reasons of record cited in the last office action.

Application/Control Number: 09/674,369

Art Unit: 1761

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4, 5, 11, 13-42 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

ARGUMENTS

Applicant's arguments filed 1-21-03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue as to the phrase "substantially excludes acidulent components" in that it is a well accepted phrase and that if acidulent materials were excluded from the acidity-reducing formulation, then it would have been easier to raise the pH of the acidic food and that would have been within the skill of the ordinary worker. However, when the amount of acidity is the entire basis of the claim, one needs to know how much acid can be found in the composition in order to rule out other compositions.

Applicants argue that the composition of Luber is designed to treat gastric reflux.

However, applicant's claims are to a composition whose ingredients have been shown.

Applicants argue as to Luber et al. that the reference does not teach the whole invention, specifically the use of sorbates or benzoates. However, such are very well known preservatives and are readily available. Therefore, it would have been obvious to substitute one preservative for another.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 09/674,369

Art Unit: 1761

Page 4

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Helen F. Pratt at telephone number 703-308-1978.

Hp 3-6-03

HELEN PRATT
PRIMARY EXAMINER